

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 9, 12, 14-19, 22 and 25 are pending in the present application. Claims 7, 8, 20 and 21 are allowed. Claim 8 was amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-6, 9, 12, 14-19, 22 and 25 are canceled. Claims 27-47 were added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The examiner has allowed claims 7, 8, 20 and 21.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 14-19 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Ball et al.*, Image Sharing for Instant Messaging, U.S. PG Pub US 2002/0126135 A1 (April 19, 2005) (hereinafter “*Ball*”) in view of *Rubin et al.*, Method and System for Copy Protection of Images Displayed on a Computer Monitor, U.S. Patent No. 6,922,693 B1 (July 26, 2005) (hereinafter “*Rubin*”), and in further view of *Land et al.*, System and Method for Multimedia Authoring and Playback, U.S. Patent No. 7,155,676 B2 (December 26, 2006), (*for motivational purposes only*) (hereinafter “*Land*”).

Claims 1-6, 14-19 and 25 have been cancelled. New claims 27-31 depending from claim 7 are added. New claims 33-37 depending from claim 8 are added. New claims 38-42 depending from claim 20 are added. New claims 44-47 depending from claim 21 are added. New claims contain features similar to, and are supported by, original claims 2-6 and 15-19. The Examiner has indicated that claims 7, 8, 20, and 21 are allowable. By virtue of their dependence from claims 7, 8, 20, and 21, new claims 27-31, 33-42, and 44-47 are therefore also allowable.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 9 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Ball* in view of *Rubin* in further view of *Land* (*for motivational purposes only*), in further view of *Outlook* (2000) (hereinafter “*Outlook*”).

Claims 9 and 22 have been cancelled. New claims 32 and 43 containing features similar to the rejected claims 9 and 22 are added. New claims 32 and 43 depend from claims 7 and 20

respectively. The Examiner has indicated that claims 7 and 20 are allowable. By virtue of their dependence from claims 7 and 20, new claims 32 and 43 are therefore also allowable.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Ball* in view of *Rubin* in further view of *Land* in further view of *McKelvie* et al., Agent Based Application Using Data Synchronization, U.S. PG Pub US 2003/0217096 A1 (November 20, 2003) (hereinafter "*McKelvie*"). Claim 12 has been cancelled. The rejection is therefore moot.

V. Conclusion

The Applicant has cancelled all of the rejected claims. New claims 27-48 each depend from claims indicated as allowable. Each new claim was previously presented as a dependent claim, such that no new matter is added. The total number of claims does not exceed the number already paid for, such that no new fees are believed necessary. The application is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: April 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Theodore D. Fay, III/

Theodore D. Fay, III
Reg. No. 48,504
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants

TDF/bw